

Cabinet – Supplementary Agenda

**Date & time**

Tuesday, 31 May
2022 at 2.00 pm

Place

Council Chamber,
Woodhatch Place, 11
Cockshot Hill, Reigate,
Surrey, RH2 8EF

Contact

Vicky Hibbert or Huma
Younis
Tel 020 8541 9229 or
07866899016

Chief Executive

Joanna Killian



We're on Twitter:
@SCCdemocracy

vicky.hibbert@surreycc.gov.uk or
huma.younis@surreycc.gov.uk

Cabinet Members: Natalie Bramhall, Clare Curran, Kevin Deanus, Matt Furniss, Marisa Heath, Sinead Mooney, Mark Nuti, Tim Oliver, Becky Rush and Denise Turner-Stewart

Deputy Cabinet Members: Maureen Attewell, Steve Bax, Jordan Beech and Rebecca Paul

4 PROCEDURAL MATTERS

a Members' Questions

(Pages 1
- 8)

There are two member questions. A response from Cabinet is attached.

b Public Questions

(Pages 9
- 10)

There is one public question. A response from Cabinet is attached.

5 REPORTS FROM SELECT COMMITTEES , TASK GROUPS, LOCAL COMMITTEES AND OTHER COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

(Pages
11 - 12)

To consider any reports from Select Committees, Task Groups, Local Committees and any other Committees of the Council.

Cabinet is asked to consider:

- A. Report on the Care Leavers Service (*Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee*). A response from Cabinet is attached.

Joanna Killian
Chief Executive

Publish: Monday, 30 May 2022

QUESTIONS, PETITIONS AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS

The Cabinet will consider questions submitted by Members of the Council, members of the public who are electors of the Surrey County Council area and petitions containing 100 or more signatures relating to a matter within its terms of reference, in line with the procedures set out in Surrey County Council's Constitution.

Please note:

1. Members of the public can submit one written question to the meeting. Questions should relate to general policy and not to detail. Questions are asked and answered in public and so cannot relate to "confidential" or "exempt" matters (for example, personal or financial details of an individual – for further advice please contact the committee manager listed on the front page of this agenda).
2. The number of public questions which can be asked at a meeting may not exceed six. Questions which are received after the first six will be held over to the following meeting or dealt with in writing at the Chairman's discretion.
3. Questions will be taken in the order in which they are received.
4. Questions will be asked and answered without discussion. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a question, provide a written reply or nominate another Member to answer the question.
5. Following the initial reply, one supplementary question may be asked by the questioner. The Chairman or Cabinet Members may decline to answer a supplementary question.

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, Surrey County Council has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

Thank you for your co-operation

CABINET – 31 MAY 2022**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Members Questions****Question (1) Mark Sugden (Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott):**

As the Secretary of State for Transport has decided to grant National Highways a Development Consent Order which allows them to proceed with their project to improve the M25 junction 10/A3 at the Wisley Interchange, planned to start in Autumn 2022, what action can and will Surrey County Council take so that residents of surrounding towns and villages both in my Division of Hinchley Wood, Claygate and Oxshott but also neighbouring villages and towns such as Cobham, are not subject to increased and potentially dangerous traffic levels while this is being constructed'.

Reply:

As part of the M25 Junction 10 A3 Wisley Interchange consent, there is a legal document, known as the Development Consent Order, that provides National Highways with the powers to construct the scheme. This Development Consent Order document contains a number of Legal Requirements with which National Highways have to comply in the development and construction of the scheme.

One such requirement - Requirement 4 - covers traffic management during construction. This states that no part of the authorised scheme can commence until a Traffic Management Plan has been submitted and approved by the Secretary of State following consultation with the Local Highway Authority, this being Surrey County Council.

The Traffic Management Plan sets out how National Highways intend to construct the scheme to mitigate impacts and set out the diversion routes they plan to use. National Highways have been consulting with Surrey County Council's Traffic Manager and Streetworks Team on the draft Traffic Management Plan. As a result, Surrey County Council have been advising National Highways of the potential for local issues that could arise from the construction of the scheme.

As part of the mitigation plans, the Council's Traffic Manager and Streetworks Team are aware that National Highways are looking at night works and narrow running lanes to avoid road closures. Surrey County Council have discussed potential diversion routes with National Highways where they might be required. Whilst it could be likely that there will be congestion arising from the works on surrounding roads at times, the measures will be designed to minimise this disruption as much as possible.

The Surrey County Council Streetworks Team can also look to plan other unrelated works around Cobham and Oxshott accordingly to minimise disruption.

Matt Furniss**Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy****31 May 2022**

Question (2) Catherine Baart (Earlswood and Reigate South):

With regard to agenda item 9 - Surrey Infrastructure Plan - Phase 2 Schemes -please confirm:

- A) That all cycling, walking and other infrastructure improvements will be completed in line with the new Highway Code requirements for new priorities for different categories of road users and this will include audit to ensure compliance.
- B) For the existing and new schemes listed in Appendices 1 and 3 please can you confirm the timing and process of public consultation, setting out the current expected timing when the public will be consulted next in each case.
- C) Please provide details of the Flood Alleviation schemes listed in Appendix 4, or where these can be found in the public domain.
- D) Please can you confirm when the Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans for each of the borough and districts will be published (except for Woking which has been in the public domain for some time).

Reply:

- A) We have committed to design and build our schemes to give priority at junctions to people walking and on bikes. We are also committed to separating pedestrians and cyclists to improve safety and encourage greater use. We will undertake safety audits on all schemes as well as inspection by Active Travel England to ensure we have complied with the appropriate highway code requirements.
- B) The engagement and consultation approach will be tailored to each scheme – depending on the local need and type of project. This will be identified at the outset in the business case. We generally would start with some form of informal engagement so we can identify residents' concerns and suggested solutions. Once we have viable proposals, we would then run a formal consultation. Whether informal engagement or formal consultation, there's likely to be an online questionnaire, alongside opportunities to discuss them in person. The Council's Communications Team will promote these to relevant groups and residents using a wide range of channels.

Details of engagement and/or consultation associated with each of those projects contained in Appendix 1 and Appendix 3 are summarised below:

| Project | |
|---|--|
| Boxgrove Roundabout, Guildford | Conversations will be held with local residents in August who live adjacent to each of the 4 schemes including all demographics and age groups, including hard to reach groups. In the autumn we will hold further conversations with local communities to ensure that we listen to views and amend our schemes accordingly. Consultation expected between August and September 2022. |
| A3100 London Road, Guildford | |
| Redhill to East Surrey Hospital via Earlsbrook Road | |
| Ashford Park Estate Low Traffic Neighbourhood | |
| Croydon Road Regeneration, Caterham | Resident consultation took place July 2021. The local Business Improvement District (BID) is fully engaged with local businesses with regular update meetings. The BID is currently joint client with TDC as they have funded design work to date. It has been agreed with TDC that if SCC Capital funding is approved in principle, the governance will change. SCC and TDC will undertake further joint engagement with residents and Parish Council from July 2022. |
| Shelvers Hill, Tadworth Flood Reduction | Plans for engagement will be determined as the business case is developed over the coming months. |
| Tongham Village & Ash Improvements | Meeting with Parish Council 6th June to present design options. Wider consultation with residents to follow in September. |
| Cranleigh High Street Public Realm Enhancements | There is a Working Party made up of Parish Council, SMARTER Cranleigh, Lions Club, some residents, representative of Chamber of Commerce which has been ongoing throughout to enable engagement with key local stakeholders. Initial concept ideas and options were shared earlier in May. Wider residents and business questionnaires will be carried out in June/July. Broader engagement during the Autumn of this year to present design options. |
| Weybridge Town Centre (additional budget for enhanced scheme) | Engagement to tie in with current Town Centre proposals being consulted on in September 2022. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Staines Iron bridge (short term improvements) | Consultation details to be confirmed |
| Flooding Environment Agency grant funding only) (external Agency only) | Scheme dependant but engagement with councillors, residents and flood groups will take place as required |

Existing and new schemes listed in Appendices 3.

| Project | |
|---|---|
| A308 Modernisation | Consultation with businesses, resident and councillors is required for the cycling and walking improvement works. Consultation expected in September 2022. |
| Weybridge Town Centre Improvement | Engagement with businesses, resident and councillors on all elements which are within the existing highway except potentially Monument Hill and Hospital junction which may require formal consultation. Elgin Road (Low Traffic Neighbourhood) and Manby Infant School Crossing will require a public consultation in September 2022 |
| Three Arch Junction Improvements | Previous design was consulted on in 2017. Further engagement needed to inform local residents on updated design. SCC will need to consult on potential parking time restriction changes on the A23. Ongoing engagement with borough councillors. Consultation to commence from January 2024 |
| Woodhatch Junction Improvements | Engagement with residents and businesses adjacent to junction once design is finalised. Ongoing engagement with councillors. Consultation to commence from July 2024 |
| Ash Vale Station access | Progress on project pending DfT AfA bid. Given this project will be led by Network Rail they will carry out the necessary public engagement activities. Dates to be confirmed following bid decision. SCC will work with Network Rail to ensure key stakeholder groups are engaged with such as Disability Empowerment Network (DEN) and Surrey Coalition of Disabled People. |
| Leatherhead Waste Transfer Station improvements | No consultation required. Project on hold |

| | |
|---|--|
| | |
| A22 Smarter Highways | Project to be rescoped. No public consultation programmed. |
| Tranche 2 Active Travel Schemes approved by Cabinet in March 2021 | We have consulted with the communities affected by the 8 tranche 2 schemes, and where required, the schemes have been amended based on feedback. This consultation was multi-faceted, ensuring that we heard from all demographics and ages within the affected communities. |

C) The projects which form the Surrey Flood Alleviation Programme are all at different stages, and the level of detail worked up for each project is correspondingly different. Where we are at early stages and are working up a business case, the information available is limited. As we approach detailed design stage and construction, the consultation and information available increases. This is shown in the table below.

| Project Name | Project Status | Link to information |
|--|---------------------------|--|
| Countywide PFR (Build Back Better) | Business case development | |
| District and Borough Officers | | |
| Overheads | | |
| Chambers Mead | Detailed design stage | Chamber Mead Wetlands - South East Rivers Trust |
| Guildford Economic Regeneration Plan SuDS Unlock | Business case development | Guildford flood alleviation scheme - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) |
| Leatherhead investigations and catchment actions | Business case development | |
| Burgh Heath FAS | Business case development | |
| Reigate FAS | Business case development | |
| South Earlswood FAS | Business case development | |

| | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|
| South Merstham FAS | Business development case | |
| South Merstham Recreation Ground | Detailed design stage | Merstham Rec - a park for everyone Merstham Recreation Ground refurbishment Reigate and Banstead (reigate-banstead.gov.uk) |
| Lower Thames Corridor Surface Water Study | Business development case | |
| Sweeps Ditch feasibility and surveys | Business development case | |
| Caterham Bourne Viaduct | Business development case | |
| Caterham on-the-hill | Construction | Caterham on the Hill and Old Coulsdon flood resilience project guidance - Surrey County Council (surreycc.gov.uk) Caterham on the Hill and Old Coulsdon flood protection programme - Surrey County Council (surreycc.gov.uk) |
| Smallfield - GiA Scheme | Business development case | |
| GBC Public Realm Improvements | Business development case | Guildford flood alleviation scheme - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) |
| Alfold (Non-GiA interventions) | Construction | |
| Alfold GiA PFR | Business development case | |
| Farnham FAS | Business development case | |
| Horsell Common/Walton Terrace | Detailed design stage | Horsell Common SANG project - Surrey County Council (surreycc.gov.uk) |
| Old Woking FAS Contribution | Business development case | |
| Woking Raingarden Retrofits | Detailed design stage | |

The engagement and consultation approach for each project is developed as appropriate. For larger schemes, drop-in sessions, letter drops, online questionnaires and consultation video calls are used. For smaller schemes that target an individual road, letter drops and house-to-house door knocking may be more suitable. Generally, there tends to be an active residents' Flood Action Group/Flood Forum in areas with larger schemes, and they are kept up to date with briefings on a regular basis. Officers would be happy to brief individual members on specific schemes.

D) The planned completion of the Local Cycling and Walking Plans (LCWIP) is set out below.

| LCWIP | Indicative Concept completion | Planned stage |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Woking Town Centre | Complete | |
| Reigate & Banstead Borough | Complete | |
| Elmbridge Borough | Jun '22 | |
| Runnymede Borough | Jun '22 | |
| Spelthorne Borough | Jun '22 | |
| Mole Valley District | Jan '23 | |
| Guildford Borough | Apr '23 | |
| Surrey Heath Borough | Apr '23 | |
| Epsom & Ewell Borough | May '23 | |
| Tandridge District | May '23 | |
| Waverley Borough | Feb '23 | |
| Farnham Town Centre | May '22 | |

Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Transport, Infrastructure and Economy
31 May 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 31 MAY 2022**PROCEDURAL MATTERS****Public Questions****Question (1): Sally Blake**

On 31 May 2022, the Council is to consider a further delay to the much-needed update of the Surrey Minerals Plan 2011, with adoption not now proposed until the end of 2024. The update will take account of climate change and biodiversity loss.

In its 'Surrey's Climate Change Strategy', the Council is committed to delivering net zero carbon emissions in Surrey by 2050 and, to achieve this, greenhouse gas emissions must be reduced against 2019 levels by 46% by 2025, 67% by 2030, 80% by 2035, 87% by 2040, 92% by 2045 and 100% by 2050.

Despite this, on 27 April 2022, the Council approved a planning application to drill for oil in Brockham up to 31 December 2036.

Although there are current needs for fossil fuels, in particular due to Russia's war on Ukraine, this should be a short-term issue until the war ends, then decreasing sharply as renewable energy takes over.

The UK's continuing disastrous loss of biodiversity needs to be reversed. The Surrey Minerals Plan needs to reflect the actions that need be taken to achieve this now.

In view of the delay in producing the updated Surrey Minerals Plan, and the urgency of tackling climate change and biodiversity loss immediately, will the Council agree to adopt temporary emergency measures on 31 May 2022 to make additions to its Surrey Minerals Plan to take account of these existential concerns, including:

- a) and increasing biodiversity than to the commercial aspirations set out in the applications. preferably refusing, or limiting to a short period ending before 2030, new and renewed fossil fuel applications that will result in greenhouse gas emissions,
- b) taking account of the direct and indirect effects of fossil fuel applications on all important biodiversity sites, including Special Areas of Conservation, Special Protection Areas, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, Sites of Nature Conservation Importance, Biodiversity Opportunity Areas, Ancient Woodland, and Ancient Trees on the Tree Register, and
- c) in considering applications, giving greater weight to protecting the needs of the environment?

Reply:

The amendment proposed to the Minerals and Waste Development Scheme will not result in a delay in the adoption of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Although the amendment would result in a modest delay in the commencement of the Preferred Options (Draft Plan) public consultation, adoption of the plan by Surrey County Council continues to be expected in 2024 as per the originally agreed timescale.

In the meantime, as the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority, Surrey County Council has a statutory duty to determine planning applications for hydrocarbon development in accordance with the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 and other material considerations including the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 and its accompanying Practice Guidance. The National Planning Policy Framework 2021 is clear that oil and gas continue to be designated as minerals of national importance; the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority must continue to plan positively for all phases of oil and gas development; and the Minerals and Waste Planning Authority must have regard to the economic (and other) benefits of oil and gas development in determining planning applications. There is no policy presumption against oil and gas development as there is for coal or peat development and therefore planning applications for such development cannot be refused on grounds of principle.

There is no mechanism to make or adopt emergency measures in relation to the Surrey Minerals Plan Core Strategy 2011 as suggested. This is a statutory policy document that forms part of the Development Plan for Surrey. The process for updating, amending, or otherwise replacing this development plan document is set out in law and is required to meet a number of tests including proportionate and effective engagement between plan-makers and communities, local organisations, businesses, infrastructure providers and operators and statutory consultees; and consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework 2021.

However, in determining planning applications for oil and gas development, Surrey County Council must ensure that proposals comply with other requirements of the National Planning Framework 2021, including planning for development in ways that avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change and help reduce greenhouse gas emissions; integrating opportunities to secure net gains for biodiversity and public access to nature in and around development sites; and refusing planning permission for development that would result in significant harm to biodiversity or adversely impact Sites of Special Scientific Interest or irreplaceable habitats

Marisa Heath & Matt Furniss
Cabinet Member for Environment & Cabinet Member for Transport,
Infrastructure and Economy
31 May 2022

CHILDREN, FAMILIES, LIFELONG LEARNING AND CULTURE SELECT COMMITTEE

Item under consideration: CARE LEAVERS SERVICE

Date considered: 7 APRIL 2022

Introduction

1. On Monday, 4 April 2022, the Committee met with care leavers to discuss their needs and the support they receive. Feedback was mixed, with most care leavers highlighting quality, timely support as well as times where they could have been better supported.
2. On Thursday, 7 April 2022, the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee took evidence from the Cabinet Member for Children and Families and senior officers regarding the Care Leavers service, in response to an Ofsted monitoring visit in September 2021. Questioning focused on the needs of, and support available to, care leavers and the pressures on the Service, in particular:
 - unaccompanied asylum-seeking looked after children and care leavers, including numbers, specific needs and support and funding;
 - supported and independent accommodation, including the suitability of accommodation, procurement, capital investment, collaboration with partners and the transitions from care and between accommodation types;
 - the cost of living, including the impact of rising energy prices;
 - support for young people at risk of, or experiencing, homelessness, include those who are not care leavers;
 - personal advisors, including their caseloads and capacity to support care leavers promptly and effectively, workforce stability and duty arrangements;
 - pathway planning; and
 - the emotional wellbeing and mental health needs of, and support for, care leavers.
3. A Member asked whether, in the context of the drive for net zero carbon emissions, the publication of the Government's Energy Security Strategy and rising energy and living costs, the council maintained a register of the energy efficiency of care leavers' accommodation and whether, where care leavers were placed in less-energy-efficient accommodation, they could be supported with meeting costs. The Committee heard that there were not any minimum requirements in respect of individual properties but in support of social value commitments, some accommodation providers had begun to issue 'smart meters' to young people, although it was acknowledged by witnesses that this did not address the issue entirely; and also that if a service user did experience financial hardship, they could raise it with their personal advisor and may receive additional support.

4. In response, the Member asked how much it cost to heat care leavers' homes and if that was not known, that the council collect the available data; however, the Committee was told that the relevant teams were not adequately resourced or suitably structured to prioritise that work, although it was accepted that the energy efficiency of accommodation would need to be given consideration in the future by the Greener Futures teams.

Recommendation

The Select Committee makes the following recommendation:

That the Corporate Parenting Service work with the Council's Greener Futures Team to understand the energy efficiency of current care leavers accommodation and opportunities for its improvement, and seek to place care leavers in energy efficient accommodation wherever possible going forward.

Liz Bowes

Chairman of the Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee

Cabinet response

The Corporate Parenting and Commissioning services welcome the Select Committee's recommendation, which supports the Council's overall priority to enable a greener future for Surrey. They remain committed to reducing the environmental impact of the accommodation and support we commission for care leavers, within the resources available. As explored in the Select Committee, this ambition needs to be balanced with our statutory responsibilities to ensure care leavers can access appropriate accommodation that meets their needs – but it is positive to note the alignment between reducing our environmental impact and work to enable more care leavers to live in or close to Surrey, as set out our [Looked after Children and Care Leaver Sufficiency Strategy](#).

Initial links have already been made with the Greener Futures team, which has led to the promotion of the [Low Carbon Across the South and East \(LOCASE\)](#) to supported accommodation providers that partner with SCC, as well as improvements to strengthen consideration of environmental impact as part of the recent supported accommodation block contract tender, through bidders' social value submissions.

In response to the Select Committee's recommendation, officers from Corporate Parenting and Commissioning are strengthening existing links with the Greener Futures Team and will be reviewing the current arrangements in place for care leaver accommodation to identify any additional steps we can take to further support our ambition for a greener future. They aim to provide an update on this during the summer.

Clare Curran

Cabinet Member for Children and Families

Background papers: [Item 5, Children, Families, Lifelong Learning and Culture Select Committee, 7 April 2022.](#)